## For the Northern District of California

UNITED ST	TATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN I	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
PATRICK MISSUD,	No. C-12-5468 EMC
Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING REQUESTS FOR
v.	JUDICIAL NOTICE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,	(Docket Nos. 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32)
Defendants.	_/

Though there is no motion currently pending in this case, Plaintiff in this case has recently filed numerous requests for judicial notice of various documents and facts. Docket Nos. 26, 27, 29, 31, 32. Additionally, he has filed what appears to be a response to a motion filed in another case. Docket No. 28.

The requests for judicial notice are **DENIED**, and Plaintiff is hereby **ORDERED** to refrain from filing future requests for judicial notice that are not submitted in connection with a properly noticed motion, response, or reply. Furthermore, Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to refrain from filing documents that do not directly pertain to the case at bar.

This Court denied Plaintiff's motions to proceed in forma pauperis on October 29 and 30. Though Plaintiff has since submitted proof that he has paid the appropriate filing fee, see Docket No. 24, there is no indication that he has served the defendants with his complaint. Accordingly, this

Case 3:12-cv-05468-EMC Document 35 Filed 11/28/12 Page 2 of 2		
1	Court will consider no further filings from Plaintiff unless he first files proof that he has served all	
2	defendants with his complaint. Furthermore, if Plaintiff does not comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m),	
3	this case will be dismissed.	
4	This order disposes of Docket No. 26, 27, 28, 29, 31 and 32.	
5		
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
7		
8	Dated: November 28, 2012	
9	EDWARD M. CHEN	
10	United States District Judge	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		